REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 10 are amended. Claims 11-13 are added by the present amendment without the introduction of new matter as described below.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-4 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bourdelais (U.S. Patent 6,727,925) in view of Lin (U.S. Patent 6,369,835). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bourdelais in view of Lin, and further in view of Davis et al. (U.S. Patent 5,969,716).

Amended Claims 1, 9 and 10, and new Claims 11-13 are fully supported by the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. Support for the amended recitations in Claims 1, 9 and 10 is found in the present specification at page 9, lines 9-15, page 10, lines 9-13, page 12, line 12 through page 14, line 5, and Fig. 1, for example. Specifically, the amended recitations of "receiving means" in Claim 1 and "the receiving" in Claims 9 and 10 are supported in the specification at page 9, lines 9-15, for example. New independent Claim 12 includes features substantially similar to Claim 1 without means plus function recitations to thereby preclude the application of 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. Support for new dependent Claims 11 and 13 which depend directly from Claims 1 and 12 is found in the present specification at page 12, line 12 through page 14, line 5, and Fig. 1, for example. The Applicant therefore submits that no new matter has been introduced.

Addressing the rejection to Claims 1, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the phrase "second storage means for storing shared scenarios" is deleted from the claims. Further, the terms "first storage means" and "third storage means" in the claims were

changed to "user video-data management means" and "temporary storage means," for

example. Support for such changes in the terms is found in Fig. 1 and the specification as

noted above. It is believed that amended Claims 1, 9 and 10 now comply with 35 U.S.C.

§112, second paragraph. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to

telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim language may be identified.

Addressing now the obviousness rejection based on <u>Bourdelais</u> and <u>Lin</u>, that rejection

is traversed by the present amendment.

Independent Claim 1 is amended by the present amendment to recite the data-

providing apparatus including:

> user video-data management means for storing said one or more
scenarios and said image data items;
> ***receiving means for receiving the image data items transmitted
by a user***;
> temporary storage means for temporarily storing edited scenarios
and edited image data items[.]

Because the data-providing apparatus includes the receiving means as recited in

Claim 1, the user can transmit over the Internet the user's own image data items such as

moving pictures, still pictures and sound files, from the user's data-processing apparatus

(e.g., the user's personal computer) to the data-providing apparatus. Accordingly, the data-

providing apparatus allows the user to remotely edit the user's newly transmitted image data

items together with the one or more scenarios and the image data items already stored at the

user video-data management means.

Further, because the data-providing apparatus includes the above features of the user

vide-data management means, the receiving means and the temporary storage means in

combination with the first and the second acquisition means, the means for selecting, the

means for allocating and the editing means, the data-providing apparatus allows the user to

remotely edit at high-speed over the Internet the image data items including those transmitted by the user as described above.[1]

With respect to the obviousness rejection based on the combined teachings of Bourdelais and Lin, the Applicant respectfully submits, however, that neither Bourdelais nor Lin teaches or suggests "user video-data management means for storing said one or more scenarios and said image data items," *"receiving means for receiving the image data items transmitted by a user;"* and "temporary storage means for temporarily storing edited scenarios and edited image data items," as recited in amended Claim 1 of the present application.

In this regard, Bourdelais discloses "a system for designing a room using a browser connected to a system remote to the browser."[2] In Bourdelais, all the images the user can manipulate are provided by the remote site.[3] Nowhere does Bourdelais disclose or suggest that the remote site has "the receiving means for receiving the image data items transmitted by a user," as recited in Claim 1 of the present application. Accordingly, the user cannot transmit the user's own images to the remote site and remotely edit such images together with the images already stored at the remote site.

Further, what Bourdelais primarily discloses is an invention which allows a user to download "simplified images of furnishings" to design a room "without having to wait for substantially photorealistic perspective images of the furnishings to be obtained by the browser[,]" "even if the user is connected to the remote system across a relatively slow connection (e.g., a model-based connection across the World Wide Web)." [4] Nowhere does Bourdelais disclose or suggest that the remote site includes the features of the user vide-data management means, the receiving means and the temporary storage means in combination

---

[1] See the present specification at page 13, lines 12-16, for example.
[2] See the Abstract of Bourdelais.
[3] See Bourdelais at column 2, lines 32-37.
[4] See Bourdelais at column 1, line 63 to column 2, line 31.

with the first and the second acquisition means, the means for selecting, the means for

allocating and the editing means, as recited in Claim 1 of the present application.

With regard to Lin, Lin discloses an invention which "enables a presentation program

to save transformed slide show presentation objects in a standard movie file format, such as

"Quick Time" and "Video for Windows[,]" so that "any application program that recognizes

the format of the movie data in the movie file may be employed to play the movie file and

display a movie of the slide show presentation."[5] Nowhere does Lin disclose or suggest the

data-providing apparatus which includes the features as recited in Claim 1 of the present

application.

Additionally, what Lin is concerned with is to convert a limitedly available movie file

format to another widely available movie file format as described above. Thus, Lin is not

concerned with a data-providing apparatus to allow the user to edit image data items in

response to a demand transmitted from a data-processing apparatus through a network.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine

Lin with Bourdelais to arrive at the present invention recited in Claim 1.

Even considering the references together, only the present specification teaches the

features of Claim 1 in which the data-providing apparatus allows the user remotely edit the

user's newly transmitted image data items together with the one or more scenarios and the

image data items already stored at the user video-data management means.

Therefore, Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the combination of teachings of

Bourdelais in view of Lin. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal

of the obviousness rejection of Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8 and 11 are considered allowable at least for the reasons

advanced for Claim 1 from which they depend directly or indirectly.

---

[5] See Lin at column 5, lines 37-47, for example.

Claim 11 is further considered allowable as Claim 11 recites an additional feature of the present invention that "the editing means is capable of editing the image data items transmitted by the user and received by the receiving means, together with the one or more scenarios and the image data items stored at the user video-data management means." As discussed above, such a feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by <u>Bourdelais</u> and <u>Lin</u>, particularly in combination with the features of Claim 1 from which Claim 11 depends.

With regard to amended independent Claims 9 and 10, substantially the same arguments as set forth above with regard to Claim 1 also apply to Claims 9 and 10 to the extent that Claims 9 and 10 include features substantially similar to those recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 9 and 10 are believed to be allowable.

New independent Claim 12 is believed to be allowable as noted above because Claim 12 includes features substantially similar to Claim 1 without means plus function recitations to thereby preclude the application of 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

New dependent Claim 13 is considered allowable at least for the reasons advanced for Claim 12 from which it depends. Claim 13 is further considered allowable, similarly to Claim 11, as Claim 13 recites an additional feature as to the editing means which is neither disclosed nor suggested by <u>Bourdelais</u> and <u>Lin</u>, particularly in combination with the features of Claim 12 from which Claim 13 depends.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the

present application is now in condition for formal allowance, and it is hereby respectfully

requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
    (OSMMN 06/04)

BDL/HY

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073